

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/671,885	09/29/2003	Robert A. Breyer	005242.00138	5372	
22907 7:	22907 7590 06/30/2005		EXAMINER		
BANNER & WITCOFF 1001 G STREET N W			RAJGURU, UMAKANT K		
SUITE 1100	21 IV W		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20001			1711		

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## **Advisory Action**

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
-	10/671,885	BREYER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Umakant K. Rajguru	1711	

Defense the Ettler of an Assess Dief	10/071,005	DICTER ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Umakant K. Rajguru	1711				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 03 June 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS API	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:  a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv		e final rejection, whicheve	er is later. In no			
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>03 June 2005</u> . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
AMENDMENTS	y must be liked within the time pent	DO SECTORITION OF CER	(41.37(a).			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bel appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for			
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s</li> </ul>	121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).		, timely filed amendm	ent canceling			
<ul><li>7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro</li></ul>	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will will not be entered, or b) ☒ will will will will will will will wi	ill be entered and an	explanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4,5 and 19</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a North date of filing a North date of the affidate of the	lotice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).						
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	·		nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of following reasons: (1) Tinkelenberg does not have to suggest soy protein since Guilbert does, (2) it is known and also obvious in the art to vary. the amount of soy protein as needed for end use/s, (3) examples in a patent illustrate (not limit) the invention, (4) instant claims do not encompass limitations of bond strength, tack property etc. and (5) as set forth in earlier office action, instant claims are directed to a product-by-process whereby it is the product (not the process) that is being examined.

James J. Seidleck Supervisory Patent Examinar Technology Center 1700